

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Target Date: 15/01/21

Application No: 201647/HOU

Address: 16 Hayfield Close

Proposal: Part one, part two storey rear extension and conversion of garage

Case officer: Tom Hughes

Site Description and Surrounding Area

The application site comprises a two storey detached property, located towards the head of a cul-de-sac. The property benefits from a forward projecting flat-roof garage and a rear conservatory extension. The property is set within a relatively cramped plot, with narrow gaps to adjacent properties and a short rear garden. The surrounding area is residential in character, comprised of properties of varying styles and design.

Proposal

The proposal is for a part one, part two storey rear extension and the conversion of the garage to a habitable room. The existing conservatory would be demolished to facilitate the proposal. The rear extension would extend across the full width of the property, projecting to a depth of 4m at the ground floor and 3m at the first floor. The extension would replicate the roof form of the existing property. The existing garage door would be replaced by brick in-fill and a window. Materials have been selected to match those of the existing property.

Plans Considered

The agent submitted the following, received on 20/11/20:

Drawing No: 21620-07 - Site Location and Block Plan

Drawing No: 21620-01 - Existing Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 21620-02 - Existing First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 21620-04 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 21620-05 - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 21620-03 - Existing Elevations

Drawing No: 21620-06 - Proposed Elevations

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultation Responses

Neighbouring owners and occupiers at 14 and 18 Hayfield Close; and 10 Oakdale Close were consulted by letter. A site notice was displayed. No letters of representation were received.

Reading Borough Transport Development Control

Raised no objection to the proposals as two off-road parking spaces can be accommodated to the site frontage.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent

The agent was advised of concerns held with the proposal on 03/02/21, and was invited to supply suitably amended plans. No amended plans have been forthcoming.

Equality Act 2010

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular

planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Planning Policy Framework

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

Policy CC7 - Design and the Public Realm

Policy CC8 - Safeguarding Amenity

Policy H9 - House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

Policy TR3 - Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

Policy TR5 - Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021)

Appraisal

Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area

Policy CC7 requires that all development be of a high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located. Policy H9 requires that an extension to a house should respect the character and appearance of the house and the pattern of neighbouring properties, and the appearance of the street as a whole, in terms of scale, location, materials and design. The Design Guide to House Extensions SPD provides more specific guidance on each type of extension.

The proposed rear extension would constitute a significant enlargement of the original dwelling, adding excessive bulk at the first floor. The rear extension would be disproportionate to the scale of the original dwelling by virtue of its depth, height, and lack of set down from the original ridgeline. The extension would have an overbearing impact on the original dwelling, lacking a sufficient degree of subservience to it.

The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling is exacerbated by the relatively modest plot size, and narrow gaps to adjacent properties. The overall scale and footprint of the extension would not aid an already cramped pattern of development. Usable outdoor amenity space would be reduced to a critical level.

In considering the acceptability of the proposals, design ques were taken from the comparable development at no. 14. A part one, part two storey rear extension was granted permission under application 171467/HOU. Similar issues to those above were raised by officers under that application, requiring a reduction in scale of the rear extension. Sufficiently amended plans were supplied, with the depth of the first floor element reduced to 2m, which was deemed satisfactory and permission was ultimately granted. The same approach was taken by officers in the consideration of this application, inviting the agent to supply similarly amended plans. No amended plans have been forthcoming, and due to the conflict with identified policy as above, the decision has been taken to refuse the application. The proposed rear extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling, contrary to Policies CC7 and H9 of the Local Plan the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD.

The proposed conversion of the garage to a habitable room is deemed to be acceptable.

Impact on neighbours

The identified policy requires that development will not cause significant harm to neighbouring residential amenities. The impact of the proposed extension on no. 14 is mitigated by the existing enlargement of that property. The opposite neighbouring property at no. 18 has not been extended to the rear, so the impact of the proposals will be more keenly felt. The proposed extension would be set away from the sideward boundaries by approximately 1m. However the depth of the extension, particularly the first floor element, would present a visual dominance and overbearing effect to the rear of no. 18. While the extension would not encroach on a 45 degree line, the proximity, height and depth of the extension would ensure that significantly harmful effects would be felt by the occupants of no. 18. The proposal is contrary to Policies CC8 and H9 and the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD on this basis.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE